

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 173 332

SP 014 430

AUTHOR Norris, William R.; McIntyre, D. John
TITLE The Congruency of Lesson Plans and Teaching.
PUB DATE [79]
NOTE 7p.
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Lesson Plans; Planning; Preservice Education;
*Student Teaching; *Teaching Procedures
IDENTIFIERS *Lesson Delivery

ABSTRACT

The lesson plans of 30 elementary and secondary level student teachers and audiotapes of lessons delivered from these plans are compared to determine the congruence between prelesson planning and actual delivery. An analysis of the audiotapes in comparison to written plans is given with reference to: (1) planning for each of three phases (introduction, development, culmination); (2) time spent on each of the phases; (3) planning of lesson objectives and their communication to students; and (4) planning and delivery activities. Two primary conclusions are drawn: first, student teachers actually attend to more phases and activities than indicated in the written plans, and second, elementary level student teachers seem to be more inclined to present lessons as planned. Several implications for teacher education are noted. First, student teachers may be able to conceptualize the instructional process more easily than they can communicate it in writing. Second, methods instructors may need to give greater attention to the problems involved in the instructional planning process. Finally, in neither the lesson plans nor in the lessons themselves was there any significant evidence that student teachers attended to the more sophisticated aspects of instructional planning such as pacing, evaluation, or individualization. (MJB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED173332

The Congruency of Lesson Plans and Teaching

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. John McIntyre

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

William R. Norris, Coordinator
Professional Education Experiences
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale

D. John McIntyre, Asst. Professor
Professional Education Experiences
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale

It is common for instructional planning to be taught to elementary and secondary majors prior to their student teaching experience. The acquisition of such a skill enables one to effectively structure instructional units. However, very little research exists about the influence of planning on teaching. It is assumed that a poor planner will conduct poorly structured lessons and that a good planner will conduct well structured lessons. Thus, the researchers conducted a descriptive study that examined the congruency between lesson plans and lessons taught. As a result, two questions were formulated:

1. Is there congruency between a student teacher's lesson plan and the lesson as it is taught?
2. Is there a difference between the activities planned and delivered by elementary student teachers and secondary student teachers?
3. Is there a difference in the amount of time spent within each phase of a lesson-introduction, development and culmination-between elementary student teachers and secondary student teachers?

Procedure. A lesson plan was collected from thirty student teachers during the beginning, middle and conclusion of a sixteen-

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SP 014430

week professional semester. In addition, each of the lessons were audiotaped. A stratified random sample of thirty-six lessons were selected as data. Of these thirty-six lessons, seventeen were planned and taught by elementary student teachers and nineteen by secondary student teachers.

Data Analysis. The researchers divided each lesson plan and lesson into three phases, introduction, developmental and culmination. Structuring activities were placed within each of these phases. The phases and structuring activities were based on the work of Hilda Taba. Two independent coders coded the lesson plans and the audiotapes according to the phases and activities included in each. Coder reliability was calculated to be .81. Mean scores, reported as percentages, were recorded for each phase of the lesson plan and lesson. These data were used to examine the congruency of the lesson plans and lessons. The phi-coefficient was utilized as a test for congruency. In order to determine significance, phi-coefficients were converted to chi-square values. In addition, coders recorded the amount of time spent in each phase and the type of structuring activity within each phase. The researchers recognize that aggregate data may present a distorted picture due to the performance of one individual.

Results: Phases

1. In this study, there was a significant tendency for student teachers either not to plan introductory developmental or culminating activities or to implement the ones they had planned ($\chi^2=10.56$, $p<.01$). Seldom were planned activities not implemented or implemented activities un-

planned. This tendency was most evident in the introductory and culminating phases of the lesson ($\chi^2=12.96$ $p<.01$ and $\chi^2=5.04$ $p<.05$ respectively). The planning and performance of elementary student teachers accounted for much of these findings.

Time: 2. In terms of actual time spent in each phase of instruction, the average lesson lasted 31 minutes with approximately 2 minutes devoted to an introduction, 26 minutes to development, and 3 minutes in culminating activities. While there was little difference in time spent introducing lessons, elementary student teachers tended to spend a third less time in the developmental phase, but a third more time on culminating activities than did secondary student teachers.

Objectives: 3. Although 77% of the student teachers wrote objectives in their lesson plans, only 32% communicated any of them verbally to the students in their classes. In this sample, student teachers actually developed 2.1 objectives per lesson, but only verbalized 0.9 objectives while teaching.

Activities: 4. It was found in this study that 43.8% of the activities planned by student teachers were actually taught while another 32% of the activities implemented were not formally planned. Only 6.8% of the activities planned went untaught. Of interest to note is the fact that the planning and implementation of activities could not be accounted for in 17% of the lessons sampled.

5. 38% of the introductory activities utilized by elementary student teachers were discussions revealing pupil's strengths and weaknesses in a given area. This compares to 28% for secondary.
6. 24% of the developmental activities utilized by secondary student teachers were lectures. No elementary student teacher used this approach.
7. 33% of the developmental activities utilized by elementary student teachers were demonstrations. This compares to 11% by secondary.
8. 28% of the developmental activities utilized by elementary student teachers were skill practices. This compares to 11% by secondary.
9. 56% of the culminating activities utilized by elementary student teachers were types of assessment or evaluation. This compares to 33% for secondary.
10. The total group of student teachers utilized .7 activities in introduction, 2.5 in development and .6 in culmination.

Conclusions/Implications. Two primary conclusions appear warranted based upon the findings identified above. First, although there is much congruency between lesson plans and lessons, student teachers actually attend to more phases and more activities in their lessons than indicated in lesson plans. While it is obvious more attention needs to be devoted to the introductory and culminating phases of lessons, these data clearly suggest that a larger percentage of student teachers do engage in introductory and

culminating activities as they are compared with their attempts at planning. Second, elementary level student teachers seem to be more inclined to present lessons as they have planned them. Attention to lesson development, statement of objectives, variety of activities, and use of time tend to support this conclusion.

These findings have several implications for teacher education. It would appear that student teachers may be able to conceptualize the instructional process better than communicate it in writing. Further research is needed to determine whether such conceptualized plans can be verbalized or whether novice teachers simply develop nonreflective routines. Also, university methods instructors perhaps need to give greater attention to the problems involved in the instructional planning process. Finally, neither in the lesson plans nor in the lessons themselves was there any significant amount of evidence that the student teachers attended to the more sophisticated aspects of instructional planning such as pacing, evaluation, or individualization.

These data do shed some light on the degree to which student teachers deal with individualizing instruction in their classrooms. For example, few student teachers introduce lessons by stating objectives or by summarizing the information or content in the culminating phase of the lesson. As a result, those pupils needing a high degree of structure are not attended to during the lesson. Also, elementary student teachers seem to emphasize demonstration and skill practice while lecturing was relied on at the secondary level. In fact, the data reveal the emphasis of a limited number of

varied activities in the teaching process. The predominance of a few structuring activities-or teaching styles-illustrate, again, the lack of focus on individual differences in learning styles. Thus, it appears that pre-service teachers need more guidance in identifying appropriate teaching styles and incorporating them into their instructional planning and performance in order to meet the diversity of learning styles encountered in the classroom. Future studies are being planned to examine how teaching and learning styles are incorporated into the planning process as well as a more detailed investigation of the complete instructional planning process.